

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action.

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,542,106 to Krenz et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,554,996 to Chatzipetros. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, Krenz in view of Chatzipetros does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious “a first antenna element, provided in the first casing; a conductor element, provided in the second casing *to form a dipole antenna together with the first antenna element,*” as required. In an example embodiment set forth in the specification, with reference to Fig. 1, it is explained on page 17, lines 15-17 that “In this case, the plate shaped conductor 4 and the ground plate 6 operate as, for instance, a dipole antenna of half-wavelength.” As can be seen in Fig .1, the plate shaped conduct (4) is located in an upper case (1) and the ground plate (6) is located in a lower case (2).

Krenz discloses an antenna (105) within a first housing element (101). An antenna (105) located in the first housing element (101) is a half-wave dipole comprising a conductive plate (107), a first terminal (108), another conductive plate (109) and a second terminal (110). All of the elements of the dipole antenna (105) are located within the first housing element (101). Krenz does appear to disclose another antenna located a second housing element (103). There is no disclosure anywhere in Krenz that the antenna (105) cooperates *together* with other antenna that is located in the second housing element (103) to form a dipole antenna. Therefore, Krenz does not disclose a first antenna element in a first casing *and* a conductor element in a second casing, which *together* form a dipole, as required by claim 1. There is no suggest, motivation, or other reason why it would be obvious to modify the teachings of Krenz to provide part of the

dipole antenna (105) in the second housing element (103). The terminal 113 of Krenz operates as a parasitic element, therefore, the terminal 113 of Krenz should not be corresponded to “a conductor element, provided in the second casing, to form a dipole antenna together with the first antenna element” since the terminal 113 is the parasitic element. Further, Chatzipetros does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the limitations of which Krenz is deficient. Therefore, since every limitation of the claim is not taught, suggested or otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references, claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record. Further, since claims 2-22 depend from claim 1, they too are patentable for the same reasons.

In addition, regarding claim 11, neither Krenz nor Chatzipetros, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or render obvious that when the first casing and the second casing are opened, the first antenna element and the conductor element form a dipole antenna. The Office Action states that Chatzipetros discloses the above fact. However, Chatzipetros only discloses that when the flap 104 is left open, either the first antenna 108 or the second antenna 110 may receive and transmit the RF signal depending on the direction of the signal and the position of the handset. This disclosure teaches away from the invention of claim 11 in which both the first antenna element and the conductor element form a dipole antenna, when the first casing and the second casing are opened. Accordingly, the combination of Krenz and Chatzipetros does not meet all of the limitations of claim 11. Therefore, the asserted combination of Krenz and Chatzipetros does not render claim 11 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 11 is respectfully requested.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is

determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-37395.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:



Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street

Suite 1200

Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108

(216) 579-1700

DATE March 11, 2008